

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**
Tuesday, May 25, 2004 - 9:00 a.m.
Nebraska State Office Building, Conference Room 6X
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents:

Click the links in the agenda
or [click here](#) for all documents (XXX KB)

1. Roll Call and Meeting Notice
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes* - [April 13, 2004](#)
4. Technical Architecture
 - Recommendation to the NITC*

Groupware Architecture	E-mail Standard for State Government Agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none">- E-mail Standard Information Web Site- Comments Received
------------------------	--

5. Technical Panel Priorities and Action Items - Revisions for 2004-2005* ([Current Version](#))
6. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)
 - Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group
 - CAP
 - Security Architecture Work Group
 - Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group

7. Other Business
8. Next Meeting Date

Tuesday, July 13, 2004

9. Adjourn

* Denotes Action Item

NITC and Technical Panel Websites: <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/>
Meeting notice posted to the NITC Website: 16 APR 2004
Meeting notice posted to the [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#): 16 APR 2004
Agenda posted to the NITC Website: 20 MAY 2004

TECHNICAL PANEL
Tuesday, April 13, 2004, 9:00 a.m.
University of Nebraska-Varner Hall
3835 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steve Henderson, Department of Administrative Services, State of Nebraska (Alternate for Brenda Decker)
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska, Compliance Officer
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools, Technology Director
Steve Schafer, Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska
Walter Weir, Chief Information Officer, University of Nebraska

ALTERNATES PRESENT:

Rick Golden, University of Nebraska
Rick Becker, Office of the Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND MEETING NOTICE

Walter Weir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A quorum was present at the time of roll call. The meeting notice was posted to the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar and the NITC web sites on March 4, 2004. The meeting agenda was posted to the NITC web site on April 9, 2004.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gene Hand. Mr. Hand informed the members that the FCC's "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" regarding "IP-Enabled Services" has a comment deadline of May 28. Mr. Hand indicated that he would e-mail members a copy of the NPRM.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 10, 2004 MINUTES

Mr. Schafer moved to approve the [February 10, 2004](#) minutes. Mr. Henderson seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Henderson-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Schafer-Yes, and Weir-Yes. Results: 5-Yes, 0-No. The motion was carried by majority vote.

TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE – [E-mail Standard for State Government Agencies](#)

Mr. Becker indicated that this draft standard was before the State Government Council on April 8. The SGC recommended forwarding this document to the Technical Panel for review. The SGC recommended adding definitions for "Basic E-mail" and "Business-Class E-mail." Members discussed the draft standard.

Mr. Schafer moved to post the standard for the 30-day comment period with the revisions suggested by the State Government Council. Ms. Horn seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Henderson-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Schafer-Yes, and Weir-Abstained . Results: 4-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstained. The motion was carried by majority vote.

PROJECT REVIEWS

STATE RECORDS BOARD GRANT APPLICATIONS

The following SRB grant applications were considered by the panel:

1. [Business Forms Search Upgrade](#)
2. [Interactive Licensing - Phase IV](#)
3. [Public Meeting Calendar Upgrade](#)
4. [Nebraska Geospatial Data Center Clearinghouse](#)

Mr. Schafer was available to answer questions with respect to projects 1-3 above

Ms. Horn recommended including a comment on accessibility testing for all of these projects. Mr. Weir expressed a concern about the lack of technical information in grant applications 1-3, limiting the ability to provide a meaningful review.

Mr. Henderson moved to provided the following comments with respect to projects 1-3:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application entitled "..." and based on the limited technical

information provided, finds that:

- The project is technically feasible.
- The proposed technology is appropriate for the project; however, an accessibility audit should be performed to ensure access for individuals with disabilities.
- The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed time frame and budget.

Ms. Horn seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Henderson-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Schafer-Abstained, and Weir-Yes. Results: 4-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstained. The motion was carried by majority vote.

Mr. Mahendra Bansal was available for questions on project 4.

Ms. Horn moved to provided the following comments with respect to projects 4:

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the grant application entitled "Nebraska Geospatial Data Center Clearinghouse" finds that:

- The project is technically feasible.
- The proposed technology is appropriate for the project; however, an accessibility audit should be performed to ensure access for individuals with disabilities.
- The technical elements can be accomplished within the proposed time frame and budget.

Mr. Weir seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Henderson-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Schafer-Yes, and Weir-Yes. Results: 5-Yes, 0-No. The motion was carried by majority vote.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND WORK GROUP UPDATES (as needed)

Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group, Christy Horn. Ms. Horn reported that a \$50,000 grant was being used to provide real-time captioning at the Lied Center, sports venues, and other locations.

CAP, Walter Weir. Mr. Weir reported that the Network Nebraska news conference in Omaha on April 12 went well.

Security Architecture Work Group, Steve Schafer. The next meeting of the work group will be scheduled when an OmniTech representative is available to meet with the group.

Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group, Tom Rolfes. Mr. Rolfes distributed a revised timeline for review of the video/audio standards.

OTHER BUSINESS:

None.

NEXT MEETING DATE, TIME AND MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held on May 11, 9:00 a.m. at Varner Hall, 3835 Holdrege, in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Ms. Horn moved to adjourn. Mr. Henderson seconded the motion. Motion passed by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Minutes were taken by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO/NITC.

The Technical Panel of the NITC is seeking comments on this draft standard. Submit comments by May 21, 2004 to rbecker@cio.state.ne.us. Comments will be considered by the Technical Panel at their meeting on May 25, 2004.

For more information on the Technical Panel go to <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us>

For more information on this draft standard go to <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/email/>

- or -

Contact:

Rick Becker, Office of the NITC, at (402)471-7984 or rbecker@cio.state.ne.us



NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

E-Mail Standard for State Government Agencies

Category	Groupware Architecture
Title	E-Mail Standard for State Government Agencies
Number	

Applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies <input type="checkbox"/> All..... Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excluding: Higher Education; and agencies receiving an exemption pursuant to Section 4.2..... Standard <input type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ Not Applicable Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval of <u>the Nebraska Information Technology Commission after review by the Technical Panel (see Section 4.2).</u> Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.
---------------	--

Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Dates	Date: (Draft) April 13, 2004 Date Adopted by NITC: Other:

1.0 Standard

1.1 E-mail Standard for State Government Agencies

The state will standardize on a unified e-mail system which provides agencies with the option of choosing a business-class e-mail product or a low-cost, basic e-mail product. These products are:

Unified E-mail System	Product
Business-Class E-mail	Lotus Notes
Basic E-mail	IBM/Lotus Workplace Messaging <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mail server hosted by IMServices • Supported user-interfaces to the Basic E-mail system are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Web browser ○ Microsoft Outlook ○ Microsoft Outlook Express [A list of supported versions of these products is available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/]

1.2 E-mail Infrastructure

The e-mail infrastructure needs to provide for secure transmission of e-mail within state government and provide for a unified e-mail directory.

1.3 Timeline - Transition from the 1997 Standard

Date	Activity
June 3, 2004	NITC approval of this standard
June 2004	Pilot testing of Basic E-mail product
July 1, 2004	Begin transition to Unified E-mail System
January 1, 2006	Finish migration to Unified E-mail System for all agencies, excluding Higher Education and those agencies receiving an exemption under Section 4.2.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

In 1997, the Information Resources Cabinet -- the predecessor of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission ("NITC") -- adopted the first electronic mail standard for Nebraska state government agencies. Section 1 of the standard states as follows:

"The state will standardize on four e-mail products from which agencies must select in order to take advantage of universal message switching and a central e-mail address directory. These products are:

- Internet Mail Products based on SMTP/MIME and IMAP4
- Lotus Notes/cc:Mail

- Microsoft Exchange
- OfficeVision (OV/VM and OV/400)”

That standard has remained unchanged since its adoption. Both the NITC and the State Government Council determined that this standard should be reviewed and recommendations made for possible revisions. A work group was formed to perform this review.

The work group, based on guidance from the State Government Council, established the following goals for this revised e-mail standard:

1. Provide for secure e-mail communications within state government.
2. Provide for regular, server-based backup of all state government e-mail, and assure that business recovery is possible.
3. Allow for gateway-based blocking of viruses and Spam.
4. Provide a unified e-mail directory for all state employees that provides information about the security of sending intra-agency e-mail communications.
5. Revise the standard to only include vendor-supported software.
6. Provide a low cost e-mail alternative.

This standard was developed to meet these goals. For more information, see the E-mail Work Group Report and Recommendations - February 2004. A link to the report is provided below in Section 6.

3.0 Definitions

3.1 Basic E-mail

“Basic E-mail” means a simple, low-cost, e-mail communication service. Features of Basic E-mail include: personal address book; personal calendar; spell check; the ability to create folders; the ability to send and receive attachments; secure transmission of mail within the Unified E-mail System; and access available through a Web browser. Per Section 1.1 above, the IBM/Lotus Workplace Messaging product, hosted by IMServices, is the approved Basic E-mail product for state government agencies.

3.2 Business-Class E-mail

“Business-Class E-mail” means a full-featured groupware application that includes e-mail communications functionality. In addition to the features available to Basic E-mail users, Business-Class E-mail includes the following features: shared calendars; group scheduling; workflow application integration; and database integration. Per Section 1.1 above, the Lotus Notes product is the approved Business-Class E-mail product for state government agencies.

3.3 Unified E-mail System

“Unified E-mail System” means the e-mail system for Nebraska state government agencies established by this document, including Business-Class E-mail and Basic E-mail. The implementation of the system will provide for secure transmission of e-mail between all users in the system; regular backup of e-mail; gateway-based blocking of viruses and Spam; and provide a unified e-mail directory.

4.0 Applicability

4.1 State Government Agencies

This standard applies to all state government agencies, except Higher Education and those agencies receiving an exemption under Section 4.2.

4.2 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC upon request by an agency.

4.2.1 Exemption Process

Any agency may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a "Request for Exemption" to the NITC. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the CIO via e-mail (info@cio.state.ne.us) or letter (Office of the CIO, 521 S 14th Street, Suite 200, Lincoln, NE 68508). Requests will be considered by the NITC after review by the Technical Panel.

5.0 Responsibility

5.1 IMServices

IMServices will incorporate the needed hardware and software into their infrastructure to provide the following:

- Basic E-mail (support for Web mail via browser only, see Other)
- Directory for e-mail accounts
- Business/disaster recovery

5.2 Other

Agencies/entities utilizing an application, other than a supported Web browser, to access Basic E-mail accounts are responsible for installation and support of the application.

6.0 Related Documents

6.1 E-mail Work Group Report and Recommendations - February 2004

[link]

E-mail Standard for State Government Agencies
Comments
21 MAY 2004

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
Gerri Monahan Nebraska Ethanol Board	"Our agency's email account is provided through Division of Communications. Will Microsoft Outlook still be an option for email?" [E-mail - 4/29]	"The Basic e-mail option allows one to use Microsoft Outlook as the front end, so the look and feel and user interface would be the same. The major difference is that the e-mail is stored on a central server, which allows for central backup and access from any location." [Schafer - E-mail - 4/29]
Shelly Norval Racing Commission	"On behalf on myself I think a universal/standard system is fine, but have a few issues not sure our covered under the plan. First: Our agency travels from City to City for Horseracing and some of our sites only have dial up as an option for internet access/email access. We use "ALLTEL" and NOL for dialup but not necessarily email. We currently pay 12 or 13 a month for this service so I would like to confirm for our agency we "have" to have service through someone and of course alltel is the most used service provider in the areas in question. Second: NOL has provided us a free 800 number for dial up and Alltel charges us. Which one would your small agency use? Question: Will this new plan affect those who need to use a "dial up" for internet access?" [E-mail - 4/29]	Internet access not affected by this standard. [Becker - Phone - 4/29]
Shelly Norval Racing Commission	"I forgot to ask you when will the Basic package be available?" [E-mail - 4/29]	"Assuming the new system is approved, transitioning is scheduled to begin in July." [Becker - E-mail - 4/29]
Jonathan Ross Nebraska Comm. for the Blind and Visually Impaired	"I am very interested to know what is being considered for the low-cost basic e-mail product. The reason I am interested, as I am sure you already know, is the question of accessibility and ease of use for State employees who are blind and use screen readers or other adaptive technologies. Do you have any information regarding the details or a suggestion of who I should contact to get more information." [E-mail - 5/3]	Set up a test account. [Ritchey - 5/5]
Lori Loyd State Fire Marshal	"I mostly have questions re: the proposed standards. 1. Will all agencies, except Legislature and Military, be required to changeover to either Business or Basic Email unless we ask to be exempted? Even if we are exempted will we eventually have to change over? 2. Will we have to change over right away or will there be a plan to migrate certain agencies at certain times until everyone is switched over by 1/2006? 3. Can we continue to use Microsoft Outlook with the Basic? The reason I ask this is that we have developed a timesheet application that is set up to use Outlook as the email program. If we can't use Outlook then we need to find out what we need to do to change the application so it will work with Lotus Notes or Lotus Workplace Messaging. This application is critical for us to use as we require more information be collected on timesheets than is possible with NIS. 4. Will we still have to have a dialup account with Alltel or another ISP for our employees outside the Lincoln Office not on the network or will the state setup an 800 number or something to connect to the mail server? 5. Will a list of the Alltel accounts be sent out to each agency contact person to	"RESPONSE: The intent, and general direction, is to have all agencies on the Unified E-mail System. Understanding that some agencies may need to be excluded, an exemption process was put in place. RESPONSE: There will be a migration period beginning in July 2004 with a target completion of January 2006. The initial implementation will focus on agencies currently using the Division of Communication's POP e-mail accounts, Nebraska@Online's POP e-mail accounts, and those users still on OfficeVision. Following that we will work with agencies currently running their own POP e-mail servers and Microsoft Exchange servers. RESPONSE: Yes, agencies can use Microsoft Outlook to access the Basic E-mail accounts. RESPONSE: This revised standard will not affect how users connect to the Internet. RESPONSE: Agencies have complete control over the number of accounts.

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
	<p>verify that all are still needed? The list indicates we have 64 Alltel accounts but we only have 63 employees and about a dozen of these employees have accounts with other ISPs because Alltel doesn't cover the area where they live. So I'm guessing there's several accounts that we may be able to get rid of.</p> <p>6. RE: the chart in Appendix E of the Recommendations for a Revised Email Standard: the features for Basic E-mail are for Lotus Workplace Messaging? If we can continue to use Outlook then we would be able to use return receipts? We have a couple of people who need this feature to make sure everyone receives notice of job openings. We've had a problem with a couple of people claiming they didn't receive the email but we were able to go back and prove to them they did as they returned a receipt.</p> <p>7. If we are able to continue to use Outlook, will employees have to check both Outlook and the Lotus Workplace Messaging for email? I'm asking this assuming we will still have to have the dialup accounts as I know there are some ISPs that won't let us set up state email accounts with their dialers or at least won't forward email from the email address they give us for the employee to the state email address so this would add some confusion to people who barely understand what they're doing now. Maybe this is part of the configuration but since I'm only familiar with POP3 I'm not entirely sure what the impact of changing over will be.</p> <p>For the most part the proposed changes will be great. It's mainly how it will impact the timesheet application that I have concerns (beside educating our employees on a new system). We would be willing to be a test agency for the Basic Email so we could test the timesheet app with the new system. From reading the score sheet it doesn't sound like if we do continue to use Outlook that we will have the secure email, spam blocking, etc so I'm guessing we're going to need to change to either Lotus Notes or Workplace Messaging."</p> <p>[E-mail - 5/3]</p>	<p>RESPONSE: The return receipt functionality in Microsoft Outlook should not be affected by the transition to Basic E-mail.</p> <p>RESPONSE: From the user's PC, Microsoft Outlook will be configured to point to the Basic E-mail server. Again, Internet access is not affected. If the user is online, they will be able to access their e-mail from their Outlook client. In addition, if the user is traveling or otherwise away from their PC, they will still be able to access their e-mail account using a Web browser on any PC connected to the Internet."</p> <p>[Becker - E-mail - 5/7]</p>
<p>Cindy Woldt Nebraska commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing</p>	<p>"Mr. Schafer: Regarding the thought of implementing Lotus Notes for all State Agencies. I understand from attending the Web Masters meeting today that each agency has the opportunity to submit to have their individual agency withdrawn from having to switch to Lotus Notes. Can you tell me how our agency can proceed on this issue."</p> <p>[E-mail - 5/5]</p>	<p>"A change to the e-mail standard is under consideration for several reasons. First, OfficeVision is going away, second, e-mail accounts provided through the Division of Communications will have a charge in the near future as a result of contract changes with the vendor providing the accounts, and third, there is growing concern about security issues relating to e-mail.</p> <p>Information regarding the proposed e-mail standard is available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/groupware/email/index.html. The proposal calls for a unified e-mail system that would achieve six important goals, including: secure e-mail communications within state government; server-based backup and recovery capability for all state government e-mail; gateway-based blocking of viruses and Spam; a unified e-mail directory for all state employees, and low cost e-mail alternative. The proposed standard would give agencies the choice between Lotus Notes and basic e-mail service that would cost \$2 per employee per month. The proposed standard includes a provision for requesting an exemption from the standard based on either a statutory exclusion, federal government requirements; or financial hardship. The NITC would determine whether to grant an exemption to an agency.</p> <p>We are in the review and comment period for this proposed standard. Comments should be submitted by May 21.</p> <p>As indicated above, the proposed standard does not require everyone to switch to NOTES. The basic e-mail system that is part of the proposed unified system is superior in several respects to the e-mail service that many agencies now purchase through the Division of Communications. Advantages include server-</p>

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
		<p>based backup and recovery capabilities, gateway-based blocking of viruses and spam, and web-based access from remote locations. The look and feel of the basic e-mail service would be the same for those agencies that now use Microsoft Outlook to access their e-mail.</p> <p>Before rejecting the proposed change, please first consider the potential benefits to your agency.</p> <p>Please let me know, if you have any further questions or comments." [Schafer - E-mail - 5/5]</p>
<p>Scott Hansen State Treasurer's Office</p>	<p>"Good Morning! I hope that you are having a great day so far. I am curious if one of you could answer a couple of questions regarding the unified email system for State Government.</p> <p>1) I assume that IM Services would be assisting each agency in migrating from their current email vendor. If this is true, what will the average cost be for each agency to have IM Services migrate from their existing E-Mail server to Lotus? Will it be a different cost for those who have Exchange versus Alltel or another provider?</p> <p>2) Section D.1 in the Recommendations for a Revised E-Mail Standard states that the average cost per user for Business Class email would be around \$10 per user and Licensing. What is the cost of the Business Class License?</p>	<p>"There is a tool that will migrate users on an Exchange server to Lotus Notes. The agency will be responsible for the overall migration (coordination, training, questions, etc.). IMServices will assist with the physical migration of email, contacts and calendar entries located on an Exchange server, by running the migration tool or showing the agency the process so they can run the migration tool. PST and/or archive files cannot be migrated unless the users copy them back to their in-box on the Exchange server before the migration tool is run. For the migration tool to work, the Exchange server will need to be on a fast reliable network connection.</p> <p>There are no migration tools for Alltel or other providers to Lotus Notes. IMServices will provide documentation on how to use an Outlook client to move mail only (no contacts, or calendar) to Lotus Notes. Agency staff can follow a documented process to move mail to the Note server. If an agency doesn't have staff to perform the migration, they can contact IMServices PCLAN and will be charged on a time and material basis. Note: Users on a dial-up account can use this process to migrate, but it can be a lengthy process.</p> <p>BASIC E-MAIL There is only one charge for basic email. That cost is currently estimated to be \$2.00 per user per month.</p> <p>BUSINESS CLASS (LOTUS NOTES) There are two costs to Lotus Notes. The costs are the hosting fee and the license fee. The hosting fee is currently \$10 per user per month. The license fee is a annual fee and the amount depends on which functionality you want.</p> <p>Notes license costs: Lotus Notes Mail and Applications (Client) \$74 per license first year. \$22 per license each year there after.</p> <p>Lotus Notes Mail Only (Client) \$54 per license first year. \$16 per license each year there after.</p> <p>Lotus Notes Mail and Applications (Browser) \$37 per license first year. \$17 per license each year there after.</p> <p>Lotus Notes Mail Only (Browser) \$37 per license first year. \$11 per license each year there after.</p>

Name / Agency	Comment	Response																		
	<p>3) Will agencies be reimbursed for the License that was purchased for Exchange? Or does each agency lose that cost while purchasing another license for Lotus?</p> <p>4) Also, can you please give me a rough estimate of how much the total cost will be for the Treasurer's Office to migrate from Exchange to Lotus Business Class? What information will you need from me to work up this estimate?</p> <p>These are some of the questions that have come up from our agency. We have many more, but feel that this is a start. If you could please address these questions for me I would greatly appreciate it. I will look forward to your reply.</p> <p>Thank you!" [E-mail - 5/7]</p>	<p>NOTE: The Lotus Notes license costs are standard government prices. If you are migrating from Exchange, you should be able to get a competitive upgrade price which would be lower.</p> <p>There are two issues which will impact agencies recovering the investments they have in existing e-mail systems: 1) the implementation timeline and 2) the exemption process.</p> <p>The implementation timeline for the Unified E-mail System has a target completion date of January 1, 2006. The initial implementation will focus on agencies currently using the Division of Communication's POP e-mail accounts, Nebrask@ Online's POP e-mail accounts, and those users still on OfficeVision. Following that we will work with agencies currently running their own POP e-mail servers and Microsoft Exchange servers. The timing for transitioning all agencies will be flexible to meet agencies needs, including time to recover costs associated with their existing e-mail system.</p> <p>Also, should an agency require additional time to recover their investment in an existing e-mail system, the standard provides for an exemption process. An agency can request an exemption from the standard which would provide additional time to recover costs.</p> <p>The goal is to transition all agencies to the Unified System by January 1, 2006 however there may be agencies which need additional time for various reasons, including recovering existing costs.</p> <p>This estimate is assuming that IMServices will only be doing the actual migration of the email, contacts, and calendar. The agency will manage and coordinate all other aspects of the migration.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>\$74</td> <td>Purchase new Notes license</td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$120</td> <td>Monthly hosting fee for one year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>=====</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$194</td> <td>Total cost per user for first year</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$22</td> <td>Annual maintenance on Notes license</td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$120</td> <td>Monthly hosting fee for one year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>=====</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$142</td> <td>Total cost per user for each additional year"</td> </tr> </table> <p>[Becker - E-mail - 5/18]</p>	\$74	Purchase new Notes license	\$120	Monthly hosting fee for one year	=====		\$194	Total cost per user for first year			\$22	Annual maintenance on Notes license	\$120	Monthly hosting fee for one year	=====		\$142	Total cost per user for each additional year"
\$74	Purchase new Notes license																			
\$120	Monthly hosting fee for one year																			
=====																				
\$194	Total cost per user for first year																			
\$22	Annual maintenance on Notes license																			
\$120	Monthly hosting fee for one year																			
=====																				
\$142	Total cost per user for each additional year"																			
<p>Michael Overton / Corey Cashmere Crime Commission</p>	<p>"I have a few questions concerning the "Basic Email" Service that our agency will most likely pursue. Currently we use MS Outlook 2000 (not express) to access one of the States POP3 Email server.</p> <p>>From the document 'E-mail Standard for State Government Agencies (Draft)' put out by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission it states that the new Basic Email service will be IMAP and "Microsoft Outlook and Outlook Express applications will connect to the Basic E-mail server using the IMAP protocol. After installation, the Basic E-mail account will appear in the list of folders used by these applications"</p> <p>My questions are</p>																			

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
	<p>1 - How would existing folders stored locally on our users PCs be effected? You have listed in the Standard..."Options for migrating address books and existing e-mail files is under consideration. More information on this will be available as implementation begins." To date I have 962 contacts in Outlook. It would not be feasible to re-add all those.</p> <p>2 - We use the shared calendar/folder feature in outlook for an office calendar. That uses a designated computer in our office as the host which then accepts and then provides appointments to all our users who have the calendar. All updates, additions, deletions are handled through email. Can the outlook 'folder sharing' feature operate under the IMAP protocol?</p> <p>3 - Is there a size or folder limit with each basic email account?</p> <p>Thank You" [E-mail - 5/10]</p>	<p>"Existing folders in Outlook, including the contacts folder, would not change. Agencies/users would have the option to transfer existing mail files and folders to the server for purposes of having a server based backup of mail files, but would not be required to do so.</p> <p>Given the information provided, it does not appear that this feature would be impacted by the transition to the Basic E-mail service; however, testing would be needed to confirm this.</p> <p>With the current configuration and estimated number of accounts, each user will have up to 100MB of disk space. There are no plans at this time, but it may be decided to bill for any additional space past that. If Outlook is used as the client, mail can be archived locally as long as it is backed up."</p> <p>[Becker - E-mail - 5/20]</p>
<p>Greg Guyer Dept. of Agriculture</p>	<p>Interested in Web mail option. Would like to meet to discuss. [Phone - Message 5/11]</p>	<p>[Becker - Phone - 5/12]</p>
<p>Vern Buis Nebraska Library Commission</p>	<p>Request for Exemption [E-mail - 5/11]</p>	
<p>Beverly Neth Dept. of Motor Vehicles</p>	<p>"Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your April 28, 2004, memo regarding the draft State Government E-Mail Standard. The Department of Motor Vehicles has been providing e-mail services to its employees for the past 2 years. The development of our own e-mail service was brought about by the DMV's rapidly expanding need for an e- mail communication system and the lack of an enterprise solution.</p> <p>The DMV specific solution incorporates a web-based service to meet the needs of DMV employees that are placed throughout the state and accounts for the limitations of the state communications network at some of those locations. Our services are offered from behind the state firewall, are backed-up nightly and follow IMAP protocol. In fact, the DMV developed e-mail service was demonstrated to the E-Mail Evaluation Group for consideration as an enterprise solution. The DMV has invested \$3,985.33 in hardware and \$1,300.00 in initial software. The annual cost for maintaining the system including new versions, anti-SPAM and anti-virus tools is \$1,042.53. The added benefits of our existing system are the ability to manage SPAM and viruses internally. Our exposure to SPAM and viruses has been all but eliminated.</p> <p>Based upon the information provided in your memo, it appears to me that converting DMV users to an enterprise solution might reduce our ability to meet the needs of our field employees and cost \$4,320.00 per year (160 employees @ \$24.00/year).</p> <p>I am pleased to see that the draft policy includes an exemption provision. The criteria for an exemption seem reasonable; however, I ask that you also consider adding a specific element for agencies that have developed their own demonstrably secure, low-cost e-mail solution." [Memo - 5/10]</p>	
<p>Heidi Burklund NE Real Estate</p>	<p>Questions/concerns: - DOC - future costs, clarification that these are actually Alltel accounts</p>	<p>[Becker - Phone - 5/14]</p>

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure e-mail - not an issues for them - Backup - they take steps to ensure covered - Spam blocking - concern about blocking; white lists? - Directory - concerns [Phone - 5/14]	
Rex Gittins Dept. of Natural Resources	<p>“With the possible exception of some special circumstances and requirements described in this memo, we believe our Agency will be able to transition to one of the e-mail options defined in the proposed State enterprise e-mail standard. This document briefly describes the present e-mail environment at the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and highlights our special circumstances and requirements. Before considering our action to comply with the revised standard, we need to know how our special needs will be met.</p> <p>We will appreciate more detailed information about planned capabilities that will facilitate our assessment of how we can continue to perform essential agency functions in an efficient and cost-effective manner.</p> <p><u>Present E-mail Environment</u></p> <p>DNR operates its own internet e-mail server using POP3. Spam blocking and anti-virus software have been implemented and are in use. E-mail accounts are managed for all DNR staff in Lincoln and some of the agency’s four remote field offices. Other field offices use independent e-mail services available at their locations. Within DNR, Microsoft Outlook is the predominant front-end software used to access email; however, a few staff use Eudora. A separate group calendaring software product (OnTime) is used.</p> <p>The agency also maintains e-mail accounts for the Nebraska Real Estate Appraiser Board and the Upper Republican Natural Resource District. These external users represent the few remaining e-mail accounts from an outreach program initiated by the Natural Resources Commission (a predecessor agency) over ten years ago.</p> <p><u>Special Circumstances and Needs</u></p> <p>The agency employs automated e-mail response capabilities to: (1) meet external requests for data, (2) enable electronic submission and receipt of documents and files from the public and service providers, and (3) to support internal information technology (IT) operations needs. These needs are described below.</p> <p>DNR is statutorily obligated to maintain and administer a data bank in the field of soil and water resources in the State of Nebraska, and to make this information available to all interested agencies and persons. In fulfillment of this obligation, the agency employs various servers and applications to support agency business processes and their related datasets including extensive map data. DNR also manages a web site that provides public access to numerous datasets of geographic information using GIS technology and Internet Map Server applications.</p> <p>The agency makes well registration documents available for online completion and submission via its web site and through Nebrask@ OnLine (NOL). An average of 20-30 online well registrations are received daily. All correspondence to correct the document is done through automatically generated email based off selected fields. After the well is registered an email is sent with information including the web location of the complete registered well document.</p> <p>IT operations includes a number of scheduled processes that execute automatically. Statistics generated and/or exceptions identified are, in many cases, reported through the use of automated e-mail messages as this is the simplest and</p>	

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
	<p>most visible means of reporting to or alerting IT staff.</p> <p>The agency web site includes a GIS Processing Site where users can complete custom data requests online. These requests are automatically processed offline, and data is returned to the requestor in user-specified formats as e-mail attachments.</p> <p>The present environment facilitates a very simple handoff from each of the applications described above to simple mail transfer protocol (SMTP).</p> <p><u>Questions/Concerns</u></p> <p>The agency wants to avoid any requirement to purchase or develop, and subsequently maintain, complex programming to achieve the functions noted above. Please respond to the following requests and questions assuming the agency opts for either the business-class or basic e-mail services identified in the proposed standard.</p> <p>1) Please provide a schematic or detailed description of the message flow and required infrastructure NITC would expect DNR to utilize to deal with its specific needs.</p> <p>2) Will the proposed standard e-mail applications and/or environments permit DNR to continue current practices involving a simple hand-off of automated e-mail messages?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If so, will DNR be required to maintain any of its current email related applications and related hardware? • If not, will DNR be expected to purchase or develop and subsequently maintain special software, or create alternate means of supplying information?" <p>[E-mail - 5/17]</p>	
<p>Lori Loyd State Fire Marshal</p>	<p>"Thought of a couple of more questions re: the new email standards.</p> <p>1. Will supervisors/management be able to access employees email so they can "monitor" usage?</p> <p>2. Will we be able to block email addresses? Even though we have a policy stating the state email isn't to be used for personal correspondence, many employees do email friends and family (beyond what is now allowed in the Acceptable Use Policy) or organizations requesting information on vacation sites, etc. Usage of the browser for personal things is even worse.</p> <p>3. Will existing or can existing email be moved from the users hard drives to the server?"</p> <p>[E-mail - 5/17]</p>	
<p>David A. Montgomery (per Dick Nelson) HHSS - R&L</p>	<p>"...no comments on or objections to the proposal"</p> <p>[E-mail - 5/17]</p>	<p>[Becker - E-mail - 5/17]</p>
<p>Scott Hansen State Treasurer's Office</p>	<p>"These answers helped us very much and we appreciate the time and effort that you put into researching our questions. I would like to let you know; however, that we have a few people in our office that will be reviewing the answers that you provided, and we are going to make a decision as to whether or not the State</p>	<p>"As a point of clarification, the May 21 deadline applies only to the comment period for the draft standard. This is NOT a deadline for requesting an exemption from the standard. Assuming the revised e-mail standard is adopted, you can, at a later date, request an exemption.</p>

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
	<p>Treasurer's Office will need to opt out of the state's unified email system.</p> <p>As you know, the treasurer's office has gone through a complete management change. Until recently, our current staff was not informed of the NITC's decision to implement a unified email system for all state agencies. Because the Child Support Payment Center is operated under the Treasurer's Office it is more practical to have one email system for the entire office. We are reviewing any possible complications this may cause with the Child Support Payment Center which is primarily funded by the federal government.</p> <p>Based on the above statements, we would like to request an extension on the deadline to decide on opting out of the unified email system at this time.</p> <p>Could you please provide us with written authorization allowing us this extension? If this is not possible to receive an extension, then please consider this our letter asking to opt out of the unified email for the state of Nebraska.</p> <p>I'm going to be gone the next couple of days. Please reply to all so that Laura Kaiser and Maryann Norton receive your reply.</p> <p>Thank you." [E-mail - 5/19]</p>	<p>Continue to review your options, and contact us if you have any questions." [Becker - E-mail - 5/20]</p>
<p>Pat Kuhry Nebraska Public Employees Retirement Systems</p>	<p>"I have reviewed the website material and the memo dated April 28, 2004 in relation to the proposed changes to the new E-mail standard. I am extremely concerned based upon what I read that the solution outlined will place our Agency in a worse position. I am hoping you can alleviate my concerns.</p> <p>To give you a little background. Our Agency has recently completed the implementation of a \$16 million custom computer system. An integral part of this system was our transition off of our NOL email and onto a local Exchange server that is integrated with our new application. I have tried to keep my comments focused on functionality and my concerns rather than trying to make a case for an exclusion. I have the following questions and concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Security. Our Agency handles information that other members of state government are not allowed to share. Examples: disability retirements for active members, all our retiree information, and retirement account balance information. We communicate within the office via email on these matters in our regular course of business. Currently, these messages do not leave our LAN and we are protected via a firewall from the State's network. Also in the area of security, since our system is new, we have firewall's and virus protection software that are 'new'. We keep our virus protection current and since going live in January of 2003, with our new architecture have never been infected with a virus. This is despite every system we have a direct connection with (the State, our vendor, and Ameritas) being infected. Finally, we use Active Directory which allows us to disable an email account at the same time we disable a user account. This provides us with a simple and instant way to handle turnover and security. Security is a very large concern since we are a client/server based system. Would we be able to have the same functionality and control over our own security? 2. Connection with our Application. Our new Application (PIONEER) which we use for virtually all of the business the Agency conducts is directly integrated with our Exchange server. We not only send and receive email from our application, but update email addresses and settings via the application. We create custom email messages that are stored in the application and then sent. We can also image our email to our FileNet system. We also send out batch emails at night. Again these things are done as a regular course of business. Does the new solution offer us a way to handle these items, or would we need to pay for 	

Name / Agency	Comment	Response
	<p>development of this functionality?</p> <p>3. Cost. We recently invested a large amount of money in our system and since we are handling our own email, there is very little ongoing cost. In reading the proposal I believe we would need to have 50 user licenses and maybe an additional 15 licenses for our servers if we were to build interfaces that would allow us to continue to manage the connectivity with our Application. I believe that we would need the lotus notes / application. Do you agree, and do you have any idea of the cost for these licenses?</p> <p>4. Compatibility. The vendor who built the application for us does not know if the lotus notes application will cause any contention with our software. When we make code changes, the code is deployed to all workstations via a script that uses WinInstal to update the appropriate settings. These settings are updated for our Microsoft office interfaces (for example Normal.dot is updated) as well as certain Windows settings. I do not know if we will have contention issues with Lotus Notes. Will there be expert resources available for testing when we migrate over that will be able to help us identify and correct compatibility issues?</p> <p>5. Management of Backups. We backup our data nightly and have access to our backups. Sometimes we need to retrieve information within the same day. Part of our backups are the Exchange emails. Do you know the process for requesting backups of the email items?</p> <p>6. Administrator access. Since we have our own server, we have Administrator access and are able to monitor our staff's email, log into former employees email accounts, reassign users to groups, grant access to folders and calendars etc.. I would assume that there would be a way for certain members of our Agency to access all of our staff's email, but would like to confirm if this will be the case.</p> <p>Thank you." [E-mail - 5/20]</p>	
<p>John O. Erickson Governor's Policy Research Office</p>	<p>"Will it be possible to convert e-mail messages/files stored or archived in Outlook to the new Basic E-mail platform or to Notes?" [E-mail - 5/21]</p>	

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Technical Panel Priorities and Action Items for 2003-04

Priorities

- TP-1 Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications infrastructure that is scalable, reliable and efficient.
- TP-2 Develop a technical architecture, including recommended standards and guidelines, to provide for interoperability and greater efficiency in IT systems.
- TP-3 Review technology projects or requests for funding recommended to the NITC, including budget requests, NITC grant requests, and Information Technology Infrastructure Fund projects.

Action Items

PRIORITY TP-1

Support the development of a robust statewide telecommunications infrastructure that is scalable, reliable and efficient.

TP 1.1

Title: Provide Technical Assistance to the Collaborative Aggregation Partnership (CAP) for the Development of Statewide Network Services.

Description: The panel will provide technical assistance for the implementation of statewide network services through the CAP and related work groups.

Lead: Brenda Decker, Network Architecture Work Group

Timeframe: Ongoing

PRIORITY TP-2

Develop a technical architecture, including recommended standards and guidelines, to provide for interoperability and greater efficiency in IT systems.

TP 2.1

Title: Recommend Technical Standards, Guidelines, and Best Practices

Description: The panel, with input from the NITC councils and other coordinating entities, will recommend the adoption of technical standards, guidelines, and best practices.

Lead: Assigned by subject

Timeframe: Ongoing

TP 2.2

Title: Technical Assistance for Aggregation and Coordination of Networks

Description: The panel will provide technical assistance for the aggregation and coordination of networks.

Lead: Assigned by subject

Timeframe: Ongoing

TP 2.2.1

Title: Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group

Description: The Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group was chartered by the Technical Panel on November 8, 2002 to develop the technical and non-technical recommendations needed in order to provide for a statewide, interconnected, synchronous video network serving citizens involved with education, state government, and telehealth.

Lead: Michael Beach

Timeframe: 1st Quarter 2003 - 1st Quarter 2004

PRIORITY TP-3

Review technology projects or requests for funding recommended to the NITC, including budget requests, NITC grant requests, and Information Technology Infrastructure Fund projects.

TP 3.1

Title: Project Reviews - Statutory

Description: Provide a technical review of project proposals as required by statute. Categories of projects that must be reviewed by the panel are: budget requests; GTCF grant fund applications; CTF grant fund applications; and ITIF funded projects. Certain long-term projects, such as NIS and NETCOM, are also reviewed periodically during the project implementation.

Lead: Rick Becker

Timeframe: Budget requests: Annual
GTCF and CTF grants: As received
ITIF funded projects: Prior to authorization of use of funds
Long-term projects: Ongoing
Education Innovation Fund Grants: Annual

TP 3.2

Title: Project Reviews - Other

Description: The panel will review projects not listed in 3.1 above at the request of the NITC, the project sponsor, or other responsible party.

Lead: Rick Becker

Timeframe: State Records Board grants: Quarterly
Voluntary reviews: As requested

TP 3.3

Title: Revise Procedures for Reviewing IT Projects and Purchases by State Agencies

Description: The panel will recommend revisions to the technical review procedures for IT related projects and purchases by state agencies. The purpose of the review process is to ensure compliance with technical standards, compatibility with existing or planned infrastructure, and sound decisions. The revised review process will be designed with the following considerations: 1) the process will incorporate all existing review procedures (e.g. the DAS 1909 form) to provide agencies with a one-step process; 2) the process for submitting requests will not be cumbersome; and 3) the review process will allow for a rapid response to the requesting agency.

Lead: DAS IT Sub-cabinet

Timeframe: 3rd Quarter 2003